DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 314 323 SO 020 432

AUTHOR Palumbo, Dennis J.
TITLE Bucking the Tide: Policy Studies in Political Science, 1978-1988.
PUB DATE 2 Sep 89
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (85th, Atlanta, GA, August 31-September 3, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Content Analysis; Interdisciplinary Approach; Literature Reviews; Periodicals; *Policy Formation; *Political Science; *Public Policy; Social Science Research
IDENTIFIERS *Arizona

ABSTRACT

Twenty years ago, many leading political scientists advised their colleagues to focus only on the policy-making process and eschew the content of policy because, they argued, the scientific discipline did not have normative standards by which to judge policy contents, and because political scientists could not become experts in the many substantive areas of policy. This paper examines all of the articles published over the past 10 years in the "American Political Science Review," the "American Journal of Political Science," "Polity," the "Western Political Quarterly," and the "Policy Studies Review." It appears that political scientists have followed this 20-year-old advice. When writing about public policy, they focused on the process of policy making, usually during policy formulation, and seldom recommend improved policy content. Political scientists are concerned more with theory, elections, and voting than they are with the outcomes of public policy. A distinctive policy "sciences" or studies approach has been developing outside of political science. This approach is multidisciplinary, problem-oriented, and normative in perspective. However, even though these policy analysts are more likely to study implementation, do evaluations, and are recommended for improving policies, they have not yet developed a unifying conceptual approach or succeeded in integrating normative concerns in their analysis. (Author/JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED314323

BUCKING THE TIDE:

Policy Studies in Political Science, 1978-1988

Dennis J. Palumbo
School of Justice Studies
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287-0403
(602) 965-7684

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

DENNIS J. PALUMBO

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 020 432

Prepared for delivery at the 1989 American Political Science Association meetings, ATlanta, GA, August 30 to September 2, 1989.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

Although public policy has received a great deal of attention from political scientists over the past twenty years, a distinctive conceptual approach that is separate from each of the many disciplines that contribute to analyzing policy has not yet been developed. Twenty years ago, many leading political scientists advised their colleagues to focus only on the policy-making process and eschew the content of policy because, they said, the scientific discipline did not have normative standards by which to judge policy contents, and because political scientists could not become experts in the many substantive areas of policy.

This paper examines all of the articles published over the past ten years in the American Political Science Review, the American Journal of Political Science, Polity, the Western Political Quarterly, and the Policy Studies Review. I find that political scientists have carefully followed the advice of twenty years ago: when they write about public policy (and it ranks among the top proportion of articles published in these journals), they focus on the process of policy making, usually during policy formulation, and seldom make recommendations for how to improve policy. Thus, this research supports what others have found. Political scientists are concerned more with theory, elections and voting than they are with the outcomes of public policy.

A distinctive policy "sciences" or studies approach has been developing outside of political science. This approach is multidisciplinary, problem-oriented, and normative in perspective. However, even though these policy analysts are more likely to study implementation, do evaluations, and make recommendations for improving policies, they have not yet developed a unifying conceptual approach or succeeded in integrating normative concerns in their analysis.

Introduction

Since the late 1960s and early 1970s, public policy has received considerable attention form political science as well as from most other social science disciplines. During the past decade, public policy has been close to the principal concern of political scientists, if we accept the proportion that public policy articles comprise of all articles published in the main political science journals as a good measure of that concern. For example, public policy is fourth in the proportion of articles published in the American Political Science Review during the past decade, with only theory, comparative and voting ahead of it (see Table 1). As I will show below, it also ranked high in the proportion of articles published in other political science journals as well.

But even with all of that attention, the discipline has failed to produce a distinctive approach to policy, nor one that is useful or used by policymakers (Hedge & Mok, 1986; Rogers, forthcoming). In 1966, several young scholars believed that public policy was "the major dependent variable that political science seeks to explain" (Dawson & Robinson, 1968; Dye, 1966; Hofferbert, 1966). At about the same time, two major books appeared that synthesized political science's contribution to public policy (Ranny, 1968; Sharkansky, 1970). But a half dozen years later, Ashford (1977, p. 570) complained that in order to "become an independent effort to understand major political changes in the modern state ... policy studies should depart from the prevailing modes of policy analysis, which are mainly derived from economics and its close relation in political science, behavioral analysis."

The "modes of policy analysis" then in existence were primarily the pluralist, interest groups paradigm which viewed policy as the dependent

variable--as the outcome or result of the political process. In this "cash register" view of politics (Krasner, 1984) government is viewed "primarily as an arena within which economic interest groups or normative social movements contended or allied with one another to shape the making of public policy decisions" (Evans, Rueschemeyer, & Skocpol, 1985). As Lowi (1989, p. 887) has noted, the most important theoretical universe for this perspective was the political system, especially as elaborated by David Easton (1960). But the state itself remained a "black box" shrouded in mystery and having little impact itself on policy.

In more recent years, some scholars (March & Olson, 1984; Nordlinger, 1987; Skocpol, 1982) have rekindled interest in the role of the state in shaping values and norms and in the institutional features of the political system. I will argue below that this may be the best focus for solving the dilemma that policy studies faces.

In this paper, I trace the development of the way political science views public policy by looking at articles published in leading political science and public policy journals over the past ten years. I am not going to characterize how leading political scientists themselves have said we should (reconstructed logic) or actually do (logics-in-use) study public policy. THus, the paper is mainly an empirical one that traces how political science has viewed public policy. I end with some conclusions about whether or not the discipline has yet developed a distinctive approach to public policy, or whether we still use the mainstream pluralist, structural-functionalist perspective, and add some of my own reflections on the direction that should be taken.

Background

Twenty years ago a number of leading political scientists advised their colleague to concentrate on the political process and avoid studying the content of public policy. They gave this advice during the behavioral era when applied, evaluative research was looked down on and political scientists were asked to abjure these kinds of studies because they produced little scientific knowledge (Sommit & Tannenhaus, 1967). Policy outputs rather than outcomes were viewed as a terminal point of research (Eaton, 1965). Ranney (1968, p. 12) provided two reasons why political scientists did not focus on policy content: (1) it would lead to evaluations and exhortations, and these are not scientific; and (2) political scientists would have to become subject matter experts in a content specialty and this would spread their intellectual efforts too thin.

Of course, there were some political scientists who disagreed with this advice, beginning with the "father" of the policy sciences, Harold Lasswell. However, Lasswell (1956) conceived of the policy sciences as multidisciplinary rather than a single discipline and as de Leon (1988, p. 23) notes, Lasswell's Merriam's, and Merton's works were "performed without an audience or, perhaps even more discouraging, those in the audience sat on their collective hands. Except for a rare review of the Lerner-Laswell volume, contemporary academicians were apparently just as oblivious to the message as their interbellum counterparts." However, some political scientists apparently were listening. Lowi (1964) turned the traditional focus of political science on its head when he, along with Froman (1968) suggested that we treat policy as the independent instead of the dependent variable. From this perspective,

instead of politics determining policy, policy determines politics. Other political scientists also were trying to develop new approaches to policy analysis. For example, Wildavsky (1968) advised political scientists to include in cost-benefit analysis political variables such as decreases in social hostility and instability, increases in support, and opening up new possibilities for future action. Ranney (1968, p. 18) wanted political scientists to go beyond mere process research and look more at contents in order, among other reasons, to see that the nation adopts the "right policies to achieve the right goals" and also because being value-free leaves political scientists mute and impotent in the face of the great political and moral crises of our time (Storing, 1962). Other voices also joined in: Van Dyke (1968, p. 24) remarked that "Without a clear perception of the values to which it could be relevant, political science became a morally directionless and scientifically sterile descriptive discipline." Van Dyke (1968, p. 37) believed we should increase our policy orientation because "our concern should be the promotion of human welfare."

But most political scientists, when they looked at policy contents at all, were concerned only with empirical analyses. Even a leading advocate of policy studies such as Sharkansky (1970) felt that policy recommendations should be subordinate to description, analysis, and understanding. If the latter has any relevance to the human condition it will occur, wrote Sharkansky (1970, p. 2), because "... understanding will aid both the formulators and the potential adopters of reform in determining the likely consequences of their actions." Sharkansky also noted that there is a tension between the desire of political scientists to reach generalizations, and that

of practitioners who want specific recommendations. Sharkansky felt the former should be emphasized because research that deals with the effects of policy are valuable only if the conclusions are based "on empirical evidence and clear standards" (p. 17).

The tension about which Sharkansky wrote is still with us today. For example, Hedge and Mok (1986), who looked at a sample of 300 articles published in six policy journals, note that even though policy studies is an established subfield in political science, it suffers uncertainty and criticisms about what we should be doing and how we should do it. They found that policy studies have had little relevance for policymakers, nor have they achieved theoretical and disciplinary integration envisioned by the founders. Some of the more extreme critics of the field say that it represents nothing new (Ricci, 1984). And some scholars question whether or not rigor is possible in policy studies since it relies so heavily on case studies. Rogers (forthcoming, p. 11) examined ten political science journals and found that "the primary quest of policy research within political science is theory that explains or predicts policy output; i.e., theories of policy making." He also found that political science research was not very useful to policymakers because of its focus: traditions in the discipline promote explanation as the primary form of policy research and this is not of much help or use to policymakers.

My own research supports these conclusions. I read the abstracts of every article published in five different journals (American Political Science Review [APSR], American Journal of Politics [AJPS], Polity, Western Political

Quarterly [WPQ], and Policy Studies Review [PSR]) for the period 1978-1988 (that is a lot of abstracts). I classified each article as to

- whether or not it dealt with public policy
- the substantive policy focus (i.e., health, welfare)
- the stage of policy making (i.e., agenda setting, formulation)
- whether or not it made recommendations for what should be done
- whether it dealt with process or outcomes
- the level of government it focused on (see Table 1)

I make no claim that the five journals I looked at represent the population of political science policy research published in journals, although I suspect that they do because my results support the Hedge and Mok (1986) and Rogers (forthcoming) findings. Nor is it the case that what is published in political science journals is a representative sample of what kind of policy research political scientists do. It may be that political scientists do a far broader kind of policy research that is delivered at conferences or published in books but not published in political science journals because of editorial biases. I suspect this is the case, although I don't have direct evidence, but editorial discretion makes a difference in what a journal publishes as I will show below. I included the Policy Studies Review along with the four other mainstream journals to see if there is a difference in what political scientists submit to a policy-oriented journal as compared to regular political science journals.

Finally, I should note that I did not have another researcher make the same analysis of the articles that I did. I did have a graduate student go through APSR and AJPS to determine if each article dealt with public policy or

another field of political science. The intercoder agreement between the graduate student and me was rather high (85%), but this is the only verification that I have that I didn't make a lot of errors or wasn't too biased when I did my content analysis of the articles.

Findings

Policy studies is among the leaders in articles published in the four political science journals; it ranks fourth in two journals (APSR & AJPS) and second in the other two (Polity & WPQ) (see Table 1). There is some variation among the four journals in their emphasis on policy studies, particularly in the number of articles published. I take this as evidence of editorial discretion. WPQ published significantly more policy studies articles than the other three journals. This may reflect the editor's discretion more than the relative proportion of policy-related articles submitted. We know that the editor of WPQ is a member of the Policy Studies Organization and so there may have been some editorial policy making in the case of WPQ, although I have no independent evidence of this.

Theory tends to outrun all the other categories in the proportion of articles published, particularly in the APSR and Polity. On the other hand, voting studies are almost equal to theory in their average ranking and are greater in the total number of articles published (247 compared to 220).[1] This latter even understates the emphasis on voting studies because a large number of the theory articles deal with voting. For example, there are

---

[1]I combined articles that dealt with voting, elections, campaigns, and political participation because they all deal with the same phenomenon. Admittedly, parties and interest groups also deal with the process of getting into office but then, so do almost all the phenomena that political scientists study.

theoretical articles focusing on a model of electoral competition in which candidates have imperfect information, on approval voting, as well as on a number of other voting or election questions. It is easy to guess why voting gets so much attention: it is quantifiable and it deals with process rather than substance.

Rather than increasing in emphasis over the period of 1978-1988 as we might expect, policy studies actually went down in rank in APSR (from 4 to 5), in AJPS (from 3 to 6), and in the WPQ (from 1 to 3). Only in Polity did the emphasis on policy studies actually increase (see Table 2). Thus, there is some indication of a decline in interest in policy studies with a concomitant rise in emphasis on voting studies (so much for the post-behavioral shift that presumably is supposed to be occurring in political science).

When political scientists do focus on policy studies, they tend to use it as a way of understanding process rather than the contents or substance of the policies studied. In fact, in most journals, there isn't a specific policy area used as the dependent variable but rather spending for all policies or policy in the abstract. As Table 3 shows, no specific policy was the focus for 28 of the total number of articles. This tied economic policy as the top-ranked policy focus.

Political scientists are environmentalists, to a certain extent, since this area ranks second with a total of 27 articles. Welfare, segregation/equal rights, criminal justice, and energy make up the remaining top foci of interest to political scientists.

The advice of some of the leading political scientists of twenty years ago seems to have been heeded very well for none of the articles on particular

policy areas gets into much detail about the substantive and important questions in the area. Instead, they tend to use policies as a way of illuminating process. No one can accuse political scientists of being experts in welfare, health, education, criminal justice, energy, or the environment. As a profession, they have relinquished these to other disciplines and professions.

Process rather than outcomes is the concern of 72 percent of all public policy articles in the five journals (see Table 4). Moreover, 65 percent of all articles deal with policy formulation rather than evaluation or implementation. The former is a process stage whereas the latter two, particularly evaluation, are outcome-oriented. And the main paradigm used by these scholars is the pluralist model in which government itself plays only a minor role as competitive interests press their concerns on the political system.

My research also supports Rogers' (forthcoming) conclusion that policy research of political scientists is seldom relevant to policymakers because it seldom makes recommendations (only 7% of the time) and it doesn't often focus on implementation or evaluation of a specific policy area (only 30% of the time). The latter stages are more likely to be of interest to policymakers than formulation. Moreover, the 30 percent of the articles that <u>do</u> focus on implementation or evaluation most often are concerned with formulating generalizations rather than recommending action to improve policy. This reflects the tensions in policy analysis that Sharkansky (1970) mentioned twenty years ago and which is still with us today.

It is clear, however, that scholars who publish in PSR are less likely to focus on process or the formulation stage than those who publish in the four political science journal (see Table 4). Thus, there is some indication that policy studies journals are likely to have a greater focus on product and evaluation than the regular political science journals. Of course, this may well be due to the bias of the editor of PSR. Unfortunately, I didn't have time to look at other policy journals but Hedge and Mok (1986) did, and they found that the six policy journals that they studied devoted about 24 percent of their attention to implementation and evaluation. This contrasts with the political science journals which devote only about 17 percent of their attention to these stages of the policy cycle. Rogers (forthcoming, Table V) also finds that only 17.6 percent of the articles in the journals he studied focused on evaluation or outcome analysis.

Finally, I should note that, except for WPQ whose articles focus on state-level policy, all the journals--including PSR--are most likely to be concerned with problems at the national rather than at the state or local levels.

Conclusions: Whither Political Science and Policy Studies?

The "normal science" process-pluralist paradigm in political science is alive and well and it has remained the same for more than a generation. This paradigm sees government as a "cash register" that totals up the pressures on it and then comes out with policies. Some political scientists may conclude that an elite rules or that the system approximates a quasi-democracy, but they fail to consider the policy outcomes that could provide empirical evidence of whether or not the process of policy making is a fair, just, or

democratic one. Political scientists fail to do this because they do not have the standards by which to judge the justice of particular policy outcomes.

In this age of heightened ideology, the only bases for judging policy outcomes are various ideologies (i.e., conservative, liberal, Marxist). In spite of considerable efforts by some political scientists (Fisher, 1980; Paris & Reynolds, 1983) the discipline has not yet developed a theoretical orientations other than those it borrows from economics, or its traditional behavioral models. Political scientists prefer to focus on technical "scientific" factors and leave values to others. Yet, it is this very focus that makes political science research irrelevant to policy making: the important questions are not about means but are about values. As Robert Lynd (1939, p. 9) noted a half century ago, "if the social scientist is too bent upon waiting until all the data re in ... the decisions will be made anyway, without him ... by the practical man and by the hard-headed politician chivvied by interest-pressure blocs."

Nature, it has been said, abhors a vacuum. There is a demand and apparently a need for policy analysis today (de Leon, 1988). And the policy sciences or policy studies field has grown considerably, led by economists and social-psychologists. Political scientists have not played a big role in this expansion, although some political scientists have contributed to this development. The main contributions that they have made have been about parts of the policy process, such as agenda setting, implementation, and termination. However, policy science has been moving in a somewhat different direction. According to de Leon (1988), the approach that is developing is multidisciplinary, problem-oriented, and normative in perspective.

The multidisciplinary nature of policy studies has been well documented. The Hedge & Mok (1986) study shows this, as does the survey that my colleague and I did (Palumbo & Musheno, 1989) of the subscribers to the Policy Studies Review. We found that only 39 percent of our subscribers were political scientists and the next largest group (11%) were affiliated with research agencies. The rest were dispersed among a dozen disciplines. However, being multidisciplinary has not led to a coherent theoretical focus. Instead, each discipline brings its own particular conceptual framework to understanding policy. Economists look at policy quite differently than psychologists or sociologists. These different perspectives help illuminate policy but instead of converging on a particular set of concepts, the multidisciplinary focus sometimes gives the impression that policy studies is little more than a babble of voices. The chances of developing a truly interdisciplinary approach are slim because of the professional need of scholars to be recognized in their own discipline.

Policy sciences may also recognize the importance of the normative dimension of policy, but the ability of the field to incorporate normative elements into its analyses is still lacking. The distinctive contribution that policy studies has made so far is the general model of the policy process, which usually includes agenda setting, problem definition, formulation, implementation, evaluation, and termination (Brewer & de Leon, 1983; Lasswell, 1956; May & Wildavsky, 1978). Each of these stages has received considerable attention and each has added greatly to our understanding of policy making. But when taken together, they offer an incomplete--although relatively rich--picture of the process of policy making.

To date, the normative component has yet to be successfully added to this process model. The most that has occurred is to "... at least explicate the contending values and thereby permit policymakers to make an honest, more informed (i.e., less hidden) judgment" (de Leon, 1988, p. 41). But this is not necessarily what policymakers want because they usually know what the contending values are and most often want to keep their own agendas hidden. They are not anxious to have policy analysts tell them what values they should pursue; their response to this usually is, "If you want to promote a particular cause, then you ought to run for office."

In other words, the very thing that many policy scholars see as inhibiting their usefulness--that is, the failure to bring values into their analyses--is exactly what policymakers do not want. Given this, the prognosis for the future of policy studies is not very good. If policymakers do not want policy analysts to get involved in questions of value, and policy analysts see that as crucial to their usefulness, we have an irresolvable conflict rather than a happy marriage.

One way out is for policy studies to take the advice of the political scientists I referred to at the beginning of this paper: Concentrate on process and don't worry about being useful to policymakers. But this is not an acceptable route to take for two reasons. Firstly, it is essential to have access to public policymakers and their data in order to test intellectual theories. This access is not likely to be forthcoming unless, similar to journalists, there is a quid pro quo--analysts need to help policymakers legitimize what they are doing by giving it an "objective scientific" stamp of

approval. Thus, it is necessary to be useful to policymakers in order to have access.

Secondly, the amount of policy research that is done depends upon there being a demand for it by policymakers (de Leon, 1988, p. 91; Wagner & Wollman, 1986). If this demand diminishes, and it will if policy analysis is not useful, then the amount of policy analysis also will diminish. Without a sufficient number of good minds devoted to doing policy analysis, there will be no progress in the field.

So, for these two reasons, it is essential for policy analysis to be useful to policymakers. The tension noted by Sharkansky (referred to above) twenty years ago is still with us and will remain so. Policy analysts and policymakers will always be partners in a very stormy marriage. Moreover, policy analysts will always be junior partners in this uneasy marriage (Wildavsky puts the ratio at 2/3 politics and 1/3 planning). When push comes to shove, political forces will win out as they did in the New Jersey income tax experiment, the swine flu panic under the Ford administration, star wars research, and cost benefit analyses during the Reagan administration (Tolchin, 1977). Of course, this is not to say that policy analysis <u>never</u> plays a role. Barber (1989) has shown that it did in the areas of educational policy, manpower and human resources, and a number of other areas (see also Mead, 1985). But the important point is that in the end, truth will always be subservient to power. The disaster at Tinanman Square in China recently (when idealistic students and scholars were brutally repressed by the army) certainly is evidence of the adage that truth comes out of the end of the barrel of a gun. However extreme this may sound, it certainly points to the

necessary direction that policy studies must take in order to continue to grow.

That direction is to change the epistemological and ontological assumptions underlying policy analysis. We still cling to the behavioral, positivist methods that have proven to be least helpful to policymakers. We cannot assume that there is a "real" world out there waiting to be discovered by us. Instead, what is out there is politics and power, and these operate under the ontological principle that reality is what we are persuaded to see, or what we want to see exist. Policy analysis is therefore an unavoidably ideological instead of a "scientific" pursuit. Certainly the large number of politically motivated "think tanks" that have been created during the last decade, most of them conservative, show that the "objective, real world out there" is one we can persuade people really exist. All policy analysis, therefore, is polemical. Academic think tanks that do not recognize this will hardly have the influence on policy that the ideological think tanks have.

Finally, a word about the role of political science in this shaky marriage. Political science <u>as a discipline</u> obviously wants no part of it. They obviously do not plan to do research of interest to policymakers. They will continue to devote most of their attention to theory (see above) because they do not want to go out into the field or offices of policymakers to collect data.

But of what use is this kind of political science research? What does it matter who gets elected under various types of electoral or voting systems? It may be that it doesn't matter a hoot for it may be that public policies are unrelated to election outcomes. Even if they are, and we don't know if they

are, we seem to have accepted the idea that we cannot accomplish through government what we so blithely believed could be done in the past. For example, Leon Wieseltier (1989), writing in the New Republic, expresses this nihilistic view in regard to the "drug crisis":

> What had come was legislation. It marked a revolution in American life, but we (or, at least, liberals, conservatives never tried to transform the society) have been brought by the underclass to the limits of such a revolution. In the end, there may not be legal and political solutions for social and cultural problems. (p. 20)

So few policy scholars have looked at policy outcomes that we really do not know what difference policy makes on the lives of people. We think it does; common sense certainly tells us it does. But we really do not know. Those who want to bring the state back in (see above) may be on the right track. It may be that institutional arrangements rather than specific policy advice are what really make a difference in the long run. The military-industrial complex, welfare bureaucracy, medical doctor-hospital empire, and the public school monopoly are a part of the outcomes of past public policies. What we need to understand is how public policy creates institutional arrangements which become the real authoritative allocators of the values and rewards of society. I don't see political scientists or policy analysts moving in this direction, so I cannot be too optimistic about the future of policy studies, especially in political science.

References

Ashford, Douglas. (1977). Political science and policy studies: Toward a structural solution. Policy Studies Journal (special issue).

Barber, Bernard. (1987). Effective social science: Eight cases in economics, political science, and sociology. New York: Russell sage.

Brewer, Gary D., & de Leon, Peter. (1983). The foundations of policy analysis. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

Dawson, R.E., & Robinson, J.E. (1963). Inter-party competition, economic variables, and welfare policies in American states. Journal of Politics, 25.

de Leon, Peter. (1988). Advice and consent: The development of the policy sciences. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Dye, Thomas. (1966). Politics, economics and the public. Chicago: Rand, McNally.

Easton, David. (1960). The political system (2nd ed.). New York: Knopf.

Easton, David. (1965). A systems analysis of political life. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Evans, Peter, Rueschemeyer, Dietrich, & Skocpol, Theda (Eds.). (1985). Bringing the state back in. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fisher, Frank. (1980). Politics, values, and public policy: The problem of methodology. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Froman, Lewis, Jr. (1968). The categorization of policy contents. In Austin Ranney (Ed.), Political science and public policy. Chicago: Markham Publishing Co.

Hedge, David M., & Mok, Jim W. (1986, March 19-22). The nature of policy studies: A content analysis of policy journal articles. Paper presented at the 1986 meeting of the Southwest Political Science Association, San Antonio, TX.

Hofferbert, Richard. (1966). The relation between public policy and some structural and environmental variables in the American states. American Political Science Review, 60.

Krasner, Stephan. (1984). Approaches to the state: Alternative conceptions and historical dynamics. Comparative Politics, 16, 223-246.

Lasswell, Harold. (1956). The decision process. College Park: University of Maryland.

Lowi, Theodore J. (1964, July). American business, public policy, case studies, and political theory. World Politics, 16, 677-715.

Lowi, Theodore J. (1988, September). Return to the state. American Political Science Review, 82(3), 885-891.

Lynd, Robert S. (1939). Knowledge for what? The place of social science in the American culture. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

March, James G., & Olsen, Johan P. (1984). The new institutionalization: Organizational factors in political life. American Political Science Review, 78, 734-749.

May, Judith, & Wildavsky, Aaron (Eds.). (1978). The policy cycle. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Mead, Laurence M. (1985, Spring). Science versus analysis: A false dichotomy. JOurnal of Policy Analysis and Management, 4(3), 415-429.

Nordlinger, Eric. (1987). Taking the state seriously. In Myron Weiner & Samual P. Huntington (Eds.), Understanding political development. Boston: Little, Brown.

Paris, David C., & Reynolds, James F. (1983). The logic of policy inquiry. New York: Longman.

Palumbo, Dennis, & Musheno, Michael. (1989, Winter). From the editors. Policy Studies Review, 8(2), 235-238.

Ranney, Austin. (1968). The study of policy content: A framework for choice. In Austin Ranney (Ed.), Political science and public policy. Chicago: Markham Publishing Co.

Ricci, David. (1984). The tragedy of political science: Politics, scholarship and democracy. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Rogers, James. (forthcoming). The role of social science disciplines in policy research: The case of political science.

Sharkansky, Ira (Ed.). (1970). Policy analysis in political science. Chicago: Markham Publishing Co.

Skocpol, Theda. (1982). Bringing the state back in. In Items (Vol. 36). New York: Social Science Research Council.

Sommit, Albert, & Tannenhaus, Joseph. (1967). The development of American political science: From Burgess to behavioralism. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

Storing, Herbert (Ed.). (1962). Essays on the scientific study of politics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Tolchin, Susan. Cost-benefit analysis.

Van Dyke, Vernon. (1968). Process and policy as focal concepts in political research. In Austin Ranney (Ed.), Political science and public policy (pp. 23-41). Chicago: Markham Publishing Co.

Wagner, Peter, & Wollmann, Hellmut. (1986). Social scientists on policy research and consulting: Some cross-national comparisons. International Social Science Journal, 38(4), 601-614.

Wieseltier, Leon. (1989, June 5). Scar tissue. The New Republic, 18-21.

Wildavsky, Aaron. (1968). The political economy of efficiency: Cost-benefit analysis, systems analysis, and program budgeting. In Austin Ranney (Ed.), Political science and public policy. Chicago: Markham Publishing Co.

TABLE 1

Relative Emphasis on Policy Studies 1978-1988

	APSR		AJPS		Polity		WPQ		All 4 Journals	
	Number*	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Total Number	Average Rank
Policy	42	4	29	4	26	2	64	2	161	3
Voting, Elections, Campaigns, Participation	86	2	62	1	22	4	77	1	247	2
Congress	23	6	32	3	19	5	29	5	103	4.75
Comparative	68	3	32	3	25	3	19	8	144	4.25
Courts	17	8	9	9	16	6	38	4	80	6.75
Theory	158	1	38	2	103	1	61	3	220	1.75
International	34	5	25	5	12	7	21	7	92	6
Parties	18	7	18	7	4	12	24	6	64	8
Public Opinion	17	8	21	6	9	8	7	11	54	8
Interest Groups	6	12	6	12	7	9	11	9	30	10.5
Public Administration	15	9	16	8	5	11	4	13	40	10.75
Presidency	13	10	12	10	6	10	4	13	35	11.25
Political Sociology	9	11	10	11	4	12	7	11	30	11.25
Urban	2	15	0	14	3	13	6	12	11	13.5
Budgeting	4	14	4	13	0	14	4	13	12	13.5
Federalism	5	12	0	14	5	11	3	14	13	12.75
History	4	14	0	14	3	13	8	10	15	12.75

*The number in this column refers to the number of articles published in each area over the 10-year period.

TABLE 2

Changes in Emphasis on Policy Studies, 1978-82 Compared to 1983-88

	APSR				AJPS				Polity				WPQ			
	1978-82		1983-88		1978-82		1983-88		1978-82		1983-88		1978-82		1983-88	
	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank
Policy	26	4	16	5	17	3	12	6	9	4	17	2	30	1	34	3
Voting, Elections, Campaigns, Participation	43	2	43	2	29	1	33	1	9	4	13	3	21	3	56	1
Congress	13	5	10	8	15	4	17	4	10	3	9	4	16	4	13	6
Comparative	31	3	37	3	14	5	18	3	12	2	13	3	10	6	9	7
Courts	5	9	12	6	9	7	4	9	8	5	8	5	12	5	26	4
Theory	72	1	86	1	19	2	19	2	31	1	72	1	23	2	38	2
International	11	6	23	4	10	8	15	5	5	6	7	6	12	5	9	7
Parties	10	7	8	10	8	10	10	7	2	8	2	10	10	6	14	5
Public Opinion	6	8	11	7	12	6	9	8	3	7	6	7	2	10	5	9
Interest Groups	0	13	6	11	3	9	3	10	5	6	2	10	5	8	6	8
Public Administration	6	8	9	9	12	6	4	9	2	8	3	9	2	10	2	11
Presidency	3	10	10	8	3	9	9	8	3	7	3	9	0	11	4	10
Political Sociology	5	9	4	12	7	8	3	10	2	8	2	10	5	8	2	11
Urban	2	11	0	15	0	11	0	11	1	9	2	10	4	9	2	11
Budget	1	12	3	13	1	10	3	10	0	10	0	11	2	10	2	11
Federalism	1	12	4	12	0	11	0	11	0	10	5	8	2	10	1	12
History	2	11	2	14	0	11	0	11	1	9	2	10	6	7	2	11

TABLE 3

Focus of Policy Studies Articles Published in Five Journals -- 1978-1988

	APSR	AJPS	Polity	WPQ	PSR		
	# of Articles	# of Articles	# of Articles	# of Articles	# of Articles	Total	Rank
Environment	2	1	5	13	6	27	2
Economy	7	5		6	10	28	1
Segregation-Equal Rights	4	2	6	7	1	20	4
Welfare	4	4	5	3	8	24	3
Drugs	1					1	13
Education	2		1	3	1	7	8
Urban	3	1		2	2	8	7
Regulation	2			3	3	8	7
Energy	2	3	1		7	13	6
Criminal Justice	1	1		3	9	14	5
Health	1				2	2	
Abortion		1		2	1	4	10
Arts		1				1	13
Rivers and Harbors		1	1			2	12
Budget							
Housing				1	2	3	11
Agriculture				2	3	5	9
Voting Rights							
Immigration				1	1	2	12
Population				1		1	13
Religion			1			1	13
Transportation			1		4	5	9
Biotechnology					2	2	12
No Specific One	2	3		13	10	28	1

TABLE 4

Stage of Policy Cycle, Recommendation, Process or Outcomes, and Levels of Government for Articles Published in Five Journals, 1978-1988

	APSR		AJPS		Polity		WPQ		PSR		All Journals	
	Number of Articles*	Percent	Number of Articles	Percent	Number of Articles	Percent	Number of Articles	Percent	Number of Articles	Percent	Number of Articles	Percent
Stage of Policy Cycle												
Agenda Setting	2	7	1	4	2	8	1	2	1	1	7	3
Formulation	24	80	21	75	18	75	49	82	31	42	143	65
Implementation	0	0	4	14	2	8	5	8	16	22	27	12
Evaluation-Impact	4	14	2	7	2	8	5	8	26	35	39	18
Total	30	100	28	100	24	100	60	100	74	100	216	100
Recommendations												
Yes	0	0	0	0	3	13	6	10	9	12	15	7
No	33	100	29	100	21	87	56	90	66	88	205	93
Total	33	100	29	100	24	100	62	100	75	100	220	100
Process or Outcomes												
Process	30	91	26	96	14	58	57	92	39	53	146	72
Outcomes	3	9	3	10	10	42	5	8	35	47	56	28
Total	33	100	29	100	24	100	62	100	75	100	202	100
Level of Government												
Federal	21	70	16	59	20	83	20	34	52	69	129	60
State	1	3	5	19	4	17	21	35	9	17	40	19
Local	5	17	6	22	0	0	13	22	9	17	33	15
Comparative	3	10	0	0	0	0	6	10	5	7	14	6
Total	30	100	27	100	24	100	60	100	75	100	216	100

*The numbers are not always identical for all categories because the categories were not applicable in some cases.